

LS990031  
patent application

C/ are suitably adapted to make electrical connection to at least one of said heaters, coolers and temperature monitors.

### **REMARKS**

In the November 06, 2002 Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-12, 14-23 and 26-35 are acknowledged as pending in the Application, wherein the Examiner has variously rejected claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-12, 14-23 and 26-35. After entry of the instant Submission and Request for Continued Examination, claims 36-83 are pending.

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview conducted on January 31, 2003. As stated during the interview, Applicants believe all pending claims to be allowable over the prior art of record with entry of the instant Response.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-12, 14-23 and 26-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,849,208 to Hayes, *et al.* in view of various references. Applicants', however, have cancelled claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-12, 14-23 and 26-35.

### **CONCLUSION**

The cited references have been reviewed and are not believed to affect the patentability of newly presented claims 36-83. Claims 36-83 are pending in the Application. Consideration of newly entered claims 36-83 is earnestly requested.

No amendment made herein was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated; rather any amendment not so identified may be considered as directed *inter alia* to clarification of the structure and/or function of the invention and Applicants' best mode for practicing the same. Additionally, no


LS990031  
patent application

amendment made herein was presented for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Furthermore, no election to pursue a particular line of argument was made herein at the expense of precluding or otherwise impeding Applicants from raising alternative lines of argument later during prosecution. Applicants' failure to affirmatively raise specific arguments is not intended to be construed as an admission to any particular point raised by the Examiner.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Response or feel that a telephone call to the undersigned would be helpful to advance prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

CYNTHIA BRISCOE  
HUINAN YUBARBARA  
FOLEYPIOTR GRODZINSKI  
JEREMY BURDON  
TONY CHAN  
RONG-FONG HUANG

  
Douglas W. Gilmore  
attorney for applicants  
Reg. No. 48,690

Dated: February 03, 2003

FAX RECEIVED  
FEB 07 2003  
GROUP 1700

Motorola, Inc.  
Corporate Law Department  
Mail Drop 56-238  
3102 North 56th Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85018-6697

tel 602.952.3482 / fax 602.952.4376  
doug.gilmore@motorola.com